

Improving The Tenth Grade Students' Speaking Achievement by Using Communication Games of SMA LTI-IGM Palembang

Meilani Ariyati¹⁾, Desi Surayatika²⁾

¹⁾Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Indo Global Mandiri,

²⁾Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Sriwijaya

Jl. Jend. Sudirman No. 629 KM.4 Palembang Kode Pos 30129

Email : meilani.ariyati@yahoo.com¹⁾, desisurayatika@yahoo.com²⁾

Abstract

This research was made based on the quasi-experimental: non-equivalent control group research that was conducted in SMA LTI-IGM Palembang. The aim of this research was to improve students' speaking achievement by implementing a technique namely communication games. In this research, there were two different samples to be judged their speaking achievement. First is experimental group which was given a treatment and second is control group which was not given any treatment. As data source, a test in oral speaking was used in this research. Before starting the research, a pre-test was taken from both groups and two raters scored the students' oral speaking based on speaking rubric score designed by Brown (2003). After implementing the treatment, both groups were given a post-test and the same raters scored their oral speaking to know the significant improvement and significant difference between the scores of both groups. The results indicated that by using this technique, the students' speaking achievement was improved. It was shown from the mean scores of pre-test in experimental group that increased from 67,47 to be 82,93 in post-test. The significant difference of the post-test scores between both of experimental and control groups could be seen from the results of the t-obtained of both groups that was 4,273. It was considered higher than the t-table for (df) 28 that was only 2,048. Accordingly, it could be claimed that teaching speaking by using communication games brought about an improvement in students' speaking achievement. This technique was good way to help students learning English in element of fun or with joyful activity and was aimed to get learners to communicate or talk as much and fluent as possible.

Keywords: improving, speaking achievement, communication games

Abstrak

Penelitian ini di buat berdasarkan penelitian kuasi-eksperimental: kelompok control non-setara yang dilakukan di SMA LTI-IGM Palembang. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa dengan menerapkan teknik permainan komunikasi. Dalam penelitian ini, ada dua sampel yang berbeda untuk dinilai pada kemampuan berbicara siswa. Pertama adalah kelompok eksperimen yang diberi perlakuan dan yang kedua kelompok control yang tidak diberi perlakuan. Sebagai sumber data, tes dalam berbicara lisan digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Sebelum memulai penelitian, pre-test diambil dari kedua kelompok dan dua penilai menilai kemampuan berbicara siswa berdasarkan skor rubrik berbicara yang dirancang oleh Brown (2003). Setelah menerapkan pengajaran, kedua kelompok diberi post-test dan penilai yang sama menilai kemampuan berbicara siswa untuk mengetahui peningkatan yang signifikan dan perbedaan yang signifikan antara skor kedua kelompok. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa dengan menggunakan teknik ini, kemampuan berbicara siswa meningkat. Hal itu di tunjukkan dari nilai rata-rata pre-test pada kelompok eksperimen yang meningkat dari 67,47 menjadi 82,93 pada saat post-test. Perbedaan yang signifikan pada saat post-test antara kedua kelompok eksperimen dan control dapat dilihat dari hasil t-hitung kedua kelompok yaitu 4,273. Nilai tersebut dianggap lebih tinggi dari t-tabel untuk (df) 28 yang hanya 2,048. dengan demikian, dapat dikatakan bahwa mengajar kemampuan berbicara dengan menggunakan permainan komunikasi meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa. Teknik ini adalah cara yang baik untuk membantu siswa belajar bahasa inggris dalam hal yang menyenangkan atau dalam kegiatan yang menyenangkan dan bertujuan untuk membuat peserta didik berkomunikasi atau berbicara sebanyak dan selancar mungkin.

Kata kunci: peningkatan, kemampuan berbicara, permainan komunikasi.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the term of 'English as a lingua franca' (ELF) has emerged as a way of referring to communication in English between speakers with different first languages (Seidlhofer, 2005, p. 339). Furthermore, today communication becomes base of social interaction, which people use it not only to understand another but also to survive in largely modern society.

Unfortunately, being successful students are not easy. Many students have been studying English for more than years, but they are still unable to use English in interacting with their teacher in the classroom or with others outside the classroom. Bashir, Azeem, & Dogar (2011, pp. 39-40) state that language learners who lack of confidence in their ability to participate successfully in oral interaction often listen in silence while others do the talking. He also identifies the problems that are being faced by language learners in a conversation are sometimes too shy and embarrassed to speak. It happens when they don't understand what others say or when they realize that a conversation partner has not understood them.

It is supported by Harmer (2007, pp. 345-348) who reveals some important points related to the teaching of speaking namely the reluctance of the students to speak and take part. The students are reluctant to speak English because they are shy and are not predisposed to express themselves in front of other people, especially when they are being asked to give personal information or opinions. Frequently, too, there is a worry about speaking badly and losing face in front of their classmates.

In addition, there are some factors that hinder the implementation of English learning in the class, including (1) students' fatigue, (2) students' saturation, and (3) students' dislike of physical activities (Hikmah, 2013, p. 205). These factors will affect students' behavior in the class that they will be lazy and not serious to learn, reluctant to complete the task given by teacher, and playing around the class.

Regarding to the problem above, it is very important to seek the way to overcome the problems students face in speaking class. In this case, the students of Tenth Grade of SMA LTI-IGM Palembang are chosen as the subject of the study.

Here, the researcher tries to propose a strategy to improve students' speaking achievement by using games namely "Communication Games". Game is a joyful activity that is encouraging and entertaining for students to stimulate and develop their interest and also to reduce their frustration in learning speaking. Therefore, it is aimed to provoke the learners to be as communicative as possible.

A. Literature Review

The mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second or foreign language learners (Richards, 2008, p. 19). It is because learners consequently often evaluate their success in language learning by

considering of how well they have improved in their spoken language proficiency. In line, Bashir, Azeem, and Dogar (2011, p. 38) agree about speaking skills are as productive skill in the oral mode. It is similar to the other skills but it is more complicated than it seems at first and involves more than just pronouncing words.

According to Harmer (2007, p. 123), good speaking activities can and should be extremely engaging for the students. The word "engaging" here means they will get tremendous satisfaction if the teacher has set up the activity properly and then can give sympathetic and useful feedback to the students with the result that their fully attention and participation can be reached.

Unfortunately, teaching speaking seems so difficult and challenging for English teacher, many activities are implemented in order to increase student ability in spoken English language. Yet, many problems are still faced by the students during speaking class. Sometimes, the students are reluctant to speak English because they are shy and are not predisposed to express themselves in front of other people, especially when they are being asked to give personal information or opinions. Frequently, too, there is a worry about speaking badly and losing face in front of their classmates (Harmer, 2007, pp. 345-348).

Furthermore, getting students to have a free discussion inside and outside the classroom gives them a chance to rehearse their speaking. Some different methods, approaches, and techniques are employed in order to encourage students to speak English. Well-prepared lesson and clear instruction during the lesson are considered motivating. Good environment also helps the students speak actively and correctly. Moreover, the teachers should try to ease students and remove their nervousness, fear and anxiety with encouraging words. In this way teachers have tried to build a free and light-hearted environment. As the result, students will feel as if they talk in real situation.

Games are considered as the effective activity to be used in teaching and learning process. It does not only make students feel fun and learn with pleasant, but also it motivates and builds students social interaction among student (McDonough & Shaw, 1993, p. 163). Games provide one way of helping the learners to experience language rather than merely study it (Wright, Betteridge & Buckby, 2006, p. 2). In line, Leon and Cely (2010, p. 16-23) also state that games are motivating and exciting experiences for students to develop their speaking skills in a fun and comfortable way. It is an activity of sport involving skill, knowledge or chance in which a person follows fixed rules and tries to win against an opponent. Hadfield (1990) mentions that there are two kinds of games; *Competitive games* in which players or teams race to be the first to reach the goal and *Co-operative game* in which players or teams work together towards a common goal. Various types of communication games can be included in teaching to stimulate students' talking and involvement in the classroom interactive communication. It has been proved by many scholars that communication games in general have a great

importance in facilitating language teaching. They are not just activities to which learners are exposed for entertainment or passing the time, but they are main activities for language teaching.

Martinson and Chu (2008, p. 478) draw games as effective tools for learning because they offer students a hypothetical environment in which they can explore alternative decisions without the risk of failure. In games, thought and action are also combined into purposeful behavior to accomplish a goal. Thus, playing games teaches us how to strategize, to consider alternatives, and to think flexibly.

Wright at al. (2006, p. 2) also mentions some advantages of games. First, games help and encourage many learners to sustain their interest and work. It helps them to overcome their boredom in learning. Second, games can provide intense and meaningful practice of language because it provides one way of helping the learners to experience language rather than merely study it. In view of language learning as hard work that students have to effort to understand and repeat the lesson accurately. Third, many games similarly provide repeated occurrence and use of a particular language form or use of specific language structures. If language conveys information and opinion, then games provide the key features of 'drill' with the added opportunity to sense the working of language as living communication. The last then games must be regarded as central to a language teacher's repertoire and not merely a way of passing the time.

From those advantages, the researcher can conclude that teaching English by using games have several benefits. Games can encourage the students to express their opinions and feelings freely in a joyful activity in which the students interact with others to practice more their English through games activities.

B. Methodology

In this research, the researcher used quantitative research approach with quasi-experimental design: the non-equivalent control group design as a method to test the hypotheses served. It was used because the participants cannot be randomly selected or randomly assigned to groups. Randomly assigning students to the artificial groups would disrupt classroom learning. Thus, the researcher chose non-equivalent control group design that is suggested by Creswell. It can be illustrated in this table below:

Table 1. Non-Equivalent Control Group Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	O ₁	X	O ₂
Control	O ₃	-	O ₄

1. Population and Sample

The population in this present study was the all tenth graders of SMA LTI-IGM Palembang in the first semester of the school year 2016/2017. The total number of students was about 116 students from 6 classes, namely X.A until X.F as shown in the table below:

Table 2. The Population of the Study

No	Class	Students
1	X A	21
2	X B	20
3	X C	15
4	X D	15
5	X E	16
6	X F	17
	Total	104

(Source: SMA LTI-IGM Palembang)

The researcher selected some samples for the study from the population of interest by using purposive sampling method in which the researcher took the samples based on some considerations. It was chosen because it was not possible to conduct the study in the population of interest. It would be time consuming and expensive. Thus, the subject of the present study was the students of class X.C and X.D which consist of 15 students per class. There were 30 students chosen as the samples. These two classes were selected because having same characteristics such as being taught by the same teacher, having the same number of students and also having low achievement in speaking. It was obtained from the interview with the English teacher.

In this research, the researcher designed one class as experimental group and another as the control group. Then, assigned experimental treatment by using communication games to the experimental group only while the control group would not be given any treatment. The sample of the study can be illustrated as follow:

Table 3. The Sample of the Study

No	Group	Class	Students
1	Experimental Group	X D	15
2	Control Group	X C	15
	Total		30

(Source: SMA LTI-IGM Palembang)

2. Instrumen

In collecting the data, the researcher used test as the only instrument. It was used to see and measure the improvement of students' speaking achievement after implementing the technique. The test was conducted twice and was in the form of oral. Here, the students were asked to describe about the appearance and personality of their idol by using the target language but in the simple form of sentence with the correct structure. This material was chosen based on their textbook "*Buku Bahasa Inggris Kelas X Semester 1*", (2014, p. 64).

A pre-test was given to the participants of both experimental and control groups to diagnose students' achievement or basic competence and existing knowledge in speaking class before implementing the treatment by using communication games. Meanwhile, a post-test was accomplished to evaluate and measure

students' speaking achievement after implementing the treatment.

The researcher collected data which were derived from the students' pre and post test by using speaking rubric score designed by Brown (2003, pp. 172-173) (see Appendix 1) and it was rated by two different raters. Then, the results of the test were analyzed by comparing the data before and after the treatment by using SPSS 22 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program. In analysing the obtained data, the researcher used paired sample t-test to know the significant improvement between both groups from their pre-test and post-test score. Meanwhile, independent sample t-test was also used to know the significant difference of the post-test scores between both groups.

3. Procedures

In implementing communication game, the researcher used three-phase technique based on the curriculum 2013 namely; (1) Opening Phase, (2) Core Phase and (3) Closing Phase.

First of all, the researcher planned what action will be done in applying the communication games in teaching speaking. The researcher prepared everything that was needed in doing the research. For instance, she prepared the lesson plan that will be used in teaching speaking class, the material that was used in implementing the action and she also prepared the teaching instrument such as sets of pictures, some usefull expressions and vocabulary and other media which are enable learners to expose their English through the activities.

After forming the lesson plan and teaching instruments, the researcher as teacher together with students discussed about material that will be studied today. She gave some useful vocabularies and also expressions needed to students and explained how to use it correctly related to the material today.

After explaining the material, the researcher applied game to stimulate students to speak. She gave the instructions about the rules of playing the game and also gave example to play it. By using the target language but in the simple form of sentence with the correct structure, they learned and tried to practice their English in speaking class without anxious or any force but in a joyful and comfortable way.

At last, the teacher together with the students reviewed and concluded the material today as whole. Here, the teacher asked students concerning materials they had been learning during the learning process. If there were problems, the teacher would give little bit time and opportunities to share and solve the problem. Sometimes she gave some advices to students.

2. Findings and Interpretations

A. The Findings of Study

The summary scores of pre-test and post-test in Experimental and Control groups were calculated by using SPSS 22.0 like shown in this following table

Table 4. *The Results of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental and Control Groups*

Variable	Categories	EXPERIMENTAL					
		Pretest			Posttest		
		Mean	Freq. and Perc	SD	Mean	Freq. and Perc	SD
Speaking Achievement	Very Poor	52,00	1 (6,7%)	0,000	0	0 (0%)	0
	Poor	61,33	6 (40%)	3,266	0	0 (0%)	0
	Average	70,40	5 (33,3%)	3,578	76,00	5 (33,3%)	0,000
	Good	80,00	3 (20%)	0,000	83,43	7 (46,7%)	4,276
	Excellent	0	0 (0%)	0	93,33	3 (20%)	2,309
Total		67,47	15 (100%)	8,798	82,93	15 (100%)	7,005
Variable	Categories	CONTROL					
		Pretest			Posttest		
		Mean	Freq. and Perc	SD	Mean	Freq. and Perc	SD
Speaking Achievement	Very Poor	52	2 (13,3%)	0,000	0	0 (0%)	0
	Poor	64	1 (6,7%)	0,000	60,00	2 (13,3%)	0,000
	Average	71,64	11 (73,3%)	3,325	72,67	9 (60%)	2,236
	Good	80	1 (6,7%)	0,000	79,00	4 (26,7%)	1,155
	Excellent	0	0 (0%)	0	0	0 (0%)	0
Total		69,07	15 (100%)	8,006	72,67	15 (100%)	6,126

Based on the table above, the result of pretest in experimental group shows that there was 1 student (6,7%) who got very poor category with the mean score was 52,00, 6 students (40%) who were in poor category with the mean score was 61,33, 5 students (33,3%) were considered in average category with the mean score was 70,40 and 3 students (20%) were in good category and the mean score was 80,00.

In contrast with the pre-test score of experimental group, in post-test, there were only 5 students (33,3%) in average category with the mean score was 76,00, 7 (46,7%) and 3 (20%) students who got good and excellent category with the mean score were 83,43 and 93,33.

In the pre-test of control group, the frequency of the students in very poor category were 2 students (13,3%) with the mean score was 52,00, 1 student (6,7%) was in poor category with the mean score was 64,00, then the students who were in average category consisted of 7 students (73,3%) with the mean score was 71,64. For good category there was only 1 student (6,7 %) with the mean score was 80,00.

Unlike the pre-test score, in post-test of control group still there were 2 students (13,3%) who got poor category in which the mean score was 60,00, 9 students (60%) who were in average category where the mean score was 72,67. The last, in good category, there were 4 students (26,7%) in which the mean score were 79,00.

Table 5. *The Results of Paired and Independent Samples T-Test*

Variable	Paired T-Test				Independent T-Test
	Experimental				
	Mean Score		Mean Difference (pre and post Exp within)	t-obtained and Sig. (pre and post Exp within)	
	Pretest	Posttest			t-obtained and Sig. (posttest Exp and Con within)
Speaking Achievement	67,47	82,93	15,467	16,358 ,000	
Variable	Paired T-Test				4,273 ,000
	Control				
	Mean Score		Mean Difference (pre and post Exp within)	t-obtained and Sig. (pre and post Exp within)	
	Pretest	Posttest			
Speaking Achievement	69,07	72,67	3,600	5,281 ,000	

Based on the table of paired sample statistics and differences above, it could be seen that in the experimental group, the mean score of the pre-test was 67,47 where the mean score of the post-test was 82,93. So, the mean difference of the pre-test and post-test of experimental group within was 15,467. On the other hand, in control group, the mean score of the pre-test was 69,07 and the post-test was 72,67. Thus, the mean difference of the pre-test and post-test of control group within was 3,600. It could be stated that there was a significant improvement from the pre-test up to the post-test of experimental and control groups. The improvement was proved from the mean difference of both groups that increased from the pre-test up to post-test.

It was also supported by the results of t-obtained from both groups. From the table above, it reveals that the t-obtained of experimental and control groups were 16,358 and 5,281 which were higher than the t-table for degrees of freedom (df) of 14 that was 2,1448 at the significance level (α) = 0,05 (p -value < α -value = 0,00 < 0,05) for two-tailed test. Since the t-obtained was higher than t-table and p -value was less than α -value, null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It was concluded that there was significant improvement in speaking achievement in both groups but the t-obtained of experimental group indicated a very significant improvement compared to the control group (Experimental = 16,358 > Control = 5,281 > 2,1448).

In another side, the analysis of the independent sample t-test in the post-test of the experimental and the control groups showed the t-obtained was 4,273. At the significance level of p -value < α -value (0,00 < 0,05) for two-tailed test and (df) 28, the t-table was 2,0484. Since the t-obtained exceeded the t-table and p -value was less than α -value, null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It could be inferred that there was a significant difference in the post-test scores of the students who were taught by using communication games technique and those who were not taught at all. The researcher assumed that the use of that technique as the treatment for the tenth graders of SMA LTI-IGM Palembang was successful to improve their speaking achievement.

B. Interpretations

From the statistical analysis above, the researcher interpreted the findings of the study. First, statistically the students in the experimental groups showed a progress in their speaking achievement before and after the treatment. Yet, it also happened to the control group that was not given any treatment, their score results showed a progress but it was not too significant. Since the t-obtained was higher than t-table, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. The results showed that there was very significant improvement and difference in speaking achievement of experimental group after they were taught by using communication games technique

compared to the control group that was not too significant. It could be seen from the mean score of both groups that increased from the pre-test up to the post-test.

In the pre-test of experimental group, the students could not deliver their ideas fluently. Almost all of them were hesitant to speak in English. Some of them still kept in silent when the researcher asked them to describe about people. It was in line with Bashir et al. (2011, pp. 39-40) who stated that during oral interaction, the students often listen in silence while others do the talking. It occurred because of their lack of confidence and it influenced on their performance in speaking.

The students were also shy and not confident to express their ideas. It was supported by Harmer (2007, pp. 345-348) who reveals that the students are reluctant to speak English because they are shy and are not predisposed to express themselves in front of other people. Frequently, too, there is a worry about speaking badly and losing face in front of their classmates.

Moreover, they were not able to describe people without using notes or doing memorization all the time. As mentioned by Chi (2011, p. 215) that "Communicating in a foreign language was unfamiliar. Whenever they wanted to speak, they wrote the sentence they wanted to say and then read it". Many of the students still used both bahasa Indonesia and English in describing people. It happened because of the habit of translating everything from English into the mother tongue and vice-versa when communicating in English (Chi, 2011, p. 215).

Besides that, some of them also had difficulties in grammar and pronunciation. They were not able to differentiate the part of speech such as *adjective*, *noun* and *verb* and the use of it in a sentence. Sometimes, the student said "*i am have an idol*" in which the word "*am*" is not supposed to be there because that sentence use an action verb "*have*" which doesn't need any linking verb. Some of them also didn't know the difference of singular and plural subjects. Sometimes they said "*she have black hair*" where it should be "*has*" not "*have*" because the subject is singular subject. According to Chi (2011, p. 215), the causes of unsuccessful communication were phonological problems, lack of vocabulary, insufficient practice of grammatical and functional structures.

Nevertheless, after giving a treatment by using communication games in experimental group, then, the researcher found that there was significant improvement in speaking achievement in that group. The improvements could be seen from the results of their post-test in which the lowest score of them was 76 and the highest was 96 compared to their pre-test in which the lowest score was 52 and the highest one was 80. It indicated that the treatment given to the students was successful. It was also supported by the other evidence of the students' speaking achievement through the researcher's observation during the implementation of the treatment.

First, the students were more confident to speak in English although many students still read notes or doing

memorization, but they were not hesitant and were fluent enough to describe about people. It was because they were accustomed to use English during the implementation of the technique. By using games, they learnt and tried to practice their English in speaking class without any anxiety or force but in a joyful and comfortable way. It was supported by Wright, Betteridge and Buckby (2006, p. 2) who stated that games provide the key features of 'drill' with the added opportunity to sense the working of language as living communication. The researcher inferred that the more they practiced, the more confident they would be. It might be because in every meeting, the researcher always asked the students to practice to communicate with other by asking question and giving the response in games activity. As we know, speaking activities should provide rehearsal opportunity – chance to practice real life speaking in the safety of classroom (Harmer, 2007, p. 123). Therefore, the researcher together with the students discussed about the material that would be learned at the beginning of that meeting such as the vocabulary and expression needed. After that, the students continued to practice and apply it in the learning process.

Besides, they were also actively engaged in the learning process. Harmer claimed that one of activities and materials which frequently engage students include: games (depending on the age of the learners and the type of game). Actually, when applying the games the students indirectly were being forced to speak but they did not realized because they were too excited in doing this activity. The researcher assumed that it might be because the games activity that was implemented in the class was entertaining and also challenging for them. The activity by using games was not boring but full of joy as Wright's (2006, p.2) statement that "Games help and encourage many learners to sustain their interest and work. It helps them to overcome their boredom in learning". No wonder, the students finally participated in the learning process with no worry in making mistakes or in getting embarrassed in front of their friends.

Moreover, most of the students also had known how to use WH question and yes-no question in order to communicate with or interact with the others. Like Shumin (2002, p. 204) said that effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions. So, during the learning process, the students always learnt how to use WH question, yes-no question and some other useful expressions appropriately with the result that they started expressing themselves by asking and answering the questions. In other words, they learnt how to communicate in real life communication with other people.

Additionally, the implementation of games in the class also had built students' intimate relationship among each others. The students had to work as a team and to work collaboratively towards a common goal. They shared everything among each others. This collaborative effort was more than just learning to work with others. It

promoted a symbiotic relationship where they could learn from each other. Thus, playing games teaches them how to strategize, consider alternatives and think flexibly (Martinson & Chu, 2008, p. 478).

Unfortunately, it did not occur in control group which was not given any treatment. Actually, this group also showed an improvement but not too significant. It was proved from the results of their post-test who still indicated a low achievement of the students and only some of them who could pass the GPA. The table of the statistical analyses reveals that the highest score of post-test was only 80 and the lowest was 60. Unlike the post-test of experimental group in which the highest score was 96 and the lowest score were 76.

3. References

- B. Seidlhofer, "Key concepts in ELT: English as a lingua franca," *ELT Journal*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 339-341, 2005.
- M. Bashir, M. Azeem, A. H. Dogar, "Factor effecting students' English speaking skills", *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 34-50, 2011.
- J. Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. United Kingdom: Longman, 2007.
- S. Hikmah, "Teaching English for senior high school in cahaya madani banten boarding school in banten province". *2nd International Seminar on Quality and Affordable Education (ISQAE)*, pp. 201-206, 2013.
- J. C. Richards, *Teaching Listening and Speaking: from Theory to Practice*. USA: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- J. McDonough, & C. Shaw, *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1993.
- A. Wright, D. Betteridge, M. Buckby, *Games for Language Learning* (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- W. U. Leon and E. V. Cely, "Encouraging teenagers to improve speaking skills through games in a colombian public school," *PROFILE Teacher Development Programme*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 11-31, 2010.
- J. Hadfield, *Intermediate Communication Games*. England: Longman, 1990.
- B. E. Martinson and S. Chu, "Impact of learning style on achievement when using course content delivered via a game-based learning object". In R. E. Ferdig (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Effective Electronic Gaming in Education*. Pennsylvania: IGI Global, 2008.
- Kemdikbud, *Bahasa Inggris: Studi dan pengajaran*, Jakarta: Balitbang, 2014.
- H. D. Brown, *Language assessment principles and classroom activities practices*, San Francisco: Longman, 2003
- K. Shumin, "Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities", In J. C. Richards &

W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (204-211), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.